

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920040053US1

PATENT

SECTION II: REMARKS

It is respectfully requested that the changes as noted above in Section I be made to the present application.

In the above referenced Office Action mailed 12/21/2005, claims 1-4, 6-11 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Brown et al (U.S. Patent Application 2004/0081293 A1, hereinafter referred to as "Brown") and claim 5 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Ludwig et al (U.S. Patent 5,978,835, hereinafter referred to as "Ludwig"). Although not noted on page 2 of the Office Action, it is assumed by the applicant that claims 12-15 were also rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Brown in accordance with the discussion on pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action.

The above noted rejections are respectfully traversed. However, in order to further the prosecution of the present application, and without waiving any of applicant's rights to argue the allowability of the originally presented claims in a subsequent appeal or other proceeding in the event that the Examiner does not concur that the present amendment places the application in condition for allowance, applicant has herein amended the claims to even further distinguish the claims from the cited references thereby placing the claims in condition for allowance.

With regard to the cited references, it is noted that Brown discloses a system and method for recording a telephone conference and replaying a portion of the recording during the conference. The Brown reference is entitled "System and Method For Volume Control Management in a Personal Telephony Recorder".

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920040053US1

PATENT

The disclosure includes initiating a telephone call between a plurality of participants, receiving voice inputs from the participants and identifying a participant corresponding to each voice input.

The Ludwig reference was cited only to show the use of a video teleconference and to allege that a video teleconference would have been obvious from the audio teleconference of Brown in view of the video teleconference of Ludwig. It is noted that there is no suggestion in either Brown or Ludwig for the hypothetical combination of Brown and Ludwig.

The present application discloses a method and system for processing a teleconference which includes a **reconnect feature** such that when a first participant in the teleconference is disconnected and then reconnected to the teleconference, a reconnect menu is displayed to **enable the first participant to select between immediately rejoining the audio teleconference or, optionally, to playing back a recording of the portion of the teleconference which was missed while the first participant was disconnected.** Neither Brown nor Ludwig discloses or suggests the above noted feature. In order to clarify the above noted feature of the present invention, all of the independent claims 1 and 18, have herein been amended to include the above described reconnect feature which clearly distinguishes the present invention from the cited references.

In particular, in paragraph 0099 of Brown, it is noted that after a dropped caller rejoins a teleconference, the portion of the call that was missed while the caller was disconnected is played. No reconnect menu is presented to the caller and the

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

2/13/2006 3:20 PM FROM: Fax Robert V. Wilder, Attorney at Law TO: 15712738300 PAGE: 011 OF 013

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920040053US1

PATENT

caller is not given a choice as to whether the caller wishes to rejoin the teleconference immediately or whether the caller wishes to replay the portion of the teleconference missed while being disconnected.

Still further, claim 2 has herein been amended to include **enabling one of the participants other than the first participant to override the first participant's reconnect options and immediately re-establish audio communication with the first participant after the first participant has been reconnected to the teleconference.** This **override feature** is not disclosed or suggested by either of the references and even further distinguishes the invention set forth in claim 2 from the cited references.

More specifically, since Brown does not disclose the reconnect option menu feature as is currently claimed in the independent claims 1 and 18, it is submitted that claims 1 and 18, as well as claims 2-17 and 19-20, which ultimately depend from and include all of the limitations of claim 1 or claim 18, are allowable under 35 USC 102(e) over Brown.

Moreover, it is further submitted that since neither Ludwig, nor Brown and Ludwig combined, disclose the above noted reconnect option menu feature as is currently presented in amended claim 5 through dependence from amended claim 1, that claim 5 as herein amended is allowable under 35 USC 103(a) over the combination of Brown and Ludwig.

Still further, since neither reference discloses or even suggests the above described **override feature** as set forth in

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920040053US1

PATENT

amended claim 2, it is submitted that claim 2 should be indicated as being allowable if re-written in independent form in the event that claim 1 is again rejected under 35 USC 102 or 35 USC 103 over the cited references.

It should be noted that applicant is claiming only that the **total combination** of elements **and relationships** as recited in the claims as herein amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Applicant is aware the individual elements of any claim can be isolated, and, when standing alone, those elements can be found in existing references. The similarity of various pieces and parts of the references as noted on pages 2-9 of the above-identified Office Action have been noted but it is believed that there is **no suggestion or nexus among the references to even suggest any combination of those references or the total combination of elements and relationships as recited in the claims as herein amended**. Where there is no teaching or suggestion in any of the references for the **specific total combination** of elements **and relationships** among those elements, as claimed by an applicant, it is submitted to be inappropriate to search the prior art using applicant's own disclosure as a recipe, to find piecemeal elements in prior art references for individual claimed elements, and then to combine those references in a manner disclosed only by the applicant in order to reject applicant's own claims.

Therefore, as herein presented, claims 1-20 are believed to be in condition for allowance, an early notice of which is hereby requested. If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting the allowance of this

ATTORNEY DOCKET: AUS920040053US1

PATENT

application, and especially if one or more new references are cited, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below, prior to the issuance of another Office Action, in order to allow the applicant the opportunity to further amend the claims by Supplemental Amendment or Examiner's Amendment, as may be appropriate, to place the claims in condition for allowance. The Examiner's attention to this matter is greatly appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert V. Wilder

Robert V. Wilder (Tel: 512-246-8555)
Registration No. 26,352
Attorney for Applicants
4235 Kingsburg Drive
Round Rock, Texas 78681